# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/866,286 | 05/25/2001 | Tetsujiro Kondo | 450100-03242 | 4616 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 20999    7590    04/11/2006 | | |

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG
745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL.
NEW YORK, NY 10151

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| RYMAN, DANIEL J |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2616 | |

DATE MAILED: 04/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2"><b><i>Advisory Action<br>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</i></b></td><td><b>Application No.</b></td><td><b>Applicant(s)</b></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>09/866,286</td><td>KONDO ET AL.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td><b>Examiner</b></td><td><b>Art Unit</b></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Daniel J. Ryman</td><td>2616</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

*--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

THE REPLY FILED <u>29 March 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

   a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

      Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

<u>NOTICE OF APPEAL</u>

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

<u>AMENDMENTS</u>

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because

   (a)☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b)☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

   (c)☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d)☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

     NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

   Claim(s) allowed: _____.

   Claim(s) objected to: _____.

   Claim(s) rejected: _____.

   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

<u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u>

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

13. ☐ Other: _____.

**HUY D. VU**
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800**

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: On page 2 of the Response, Applicant asserts that Pitot does not disclose "a plurality of kinds of data" as required by claim 1. Examiner, respectfully, disagrees. Pitot teaches that the tag of each message relates to a descriptor where the descriptors belong to various categories including parameters for preprocessing of a message and an instruction to compare information in the message with stored information (col. 3, lines 7-17). Thus, the "digital messages" comprise different kinds of data, including data that is to be processed using a preprocessor and data to be compared with stored data.

Applicant further asserts on pages 2-3 of the Response that Pitot does not disclose "detecting means for detecting a type of each of a plurality of kinds of data" since Pitot "identifies the identification tag and analyzes its content in order to ascertain whether it corresponds to a locally available preprocessing program." Applicant seems to assume that there is only a single program on each device such that the device only checks to determine whether the device should accept the message. However, as outlined above, each device performs different operations on a packet depending on the information contained in the packet. Thus, each device receives multiple types of packets. In addition, Pitot discloses in the passage cited in the Office Action, namely col. 2, lines 17-25, that "the equipment item in question will look for the relevant preprocessing program in its memory and run[] it." This implies that the device determines which type of data it has received and then selects a relevant preprocessing program to process the data. As such, Examiner maintains that Pitot discloses "detecting means for detecting a type of each of a pluality of kinds of data."

On page 3 of the Response, Applicant asserts that Pitot does not disclose that the "operation of the processing means is changed to one of the plurality of functional operations that corresponds to the type of data." Again, Examiner, respectfully, disagrees. As outline above, Pitot discloses that the device determines which type of data it has received and then selects a relevant preprocessing program to process the data. As such, Examiner maintains that Pitot discloses that the "operation of the processing means is changed to one of the plurality of functional operations that corresponds to the type of data."

In view of the foregoing, Examiner maintains that the claims are obvious in view of the cited prior art.

2